

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated September 21, 2006 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 13, 14 and 22 are amended, and claims 4, 5, 15, 16, 26 and 27 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants are grateful for the indication that claims 5, 13, 16 and 22 recite allowable subject matter. Accordingly, the subject matter of claims 4 and 5 are incorporated into claim 1, the subject matter of claims 15 and 16 are incorporated into claim 14, and claims 13 and 22 are rewritten into independent form. Claims 4, 5, 15, 16, 26 and 27 are cancelled. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Claims 1-3, 6-14 and 17-25 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6-7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US Patent No. 6,993,332 to Pederson (Pederson), in view of US Patent No. 5,995,836 to Wijk (Wijk). The rejection of claims 4, 15, 26 and 27 are moot in light of the cancellation of these claims.

As discussed above, the allowable subject matter of claims 5, 13, 16 and 22 is incorporated into claims 1, 14 respectively, and claim 22 is amended into independent form. Thus, independent claims 1, 14, and 22 are allowable. Further, because claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 17, and 20 depend from claims 1 and 14, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as claims 1 and 14.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 1, 2, 6-7, 9, 12, 14, 17, 20 and 22 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 3 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pederson and Wijk, in view of US Patent Publication No. 2003/0157934 to Liang (Liang).

Applicants respectfully submit that because claims 3 and 18 depend from claims 1 and 14, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as claims 1 and 14, as well as for the additional features recited in these dependent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 18 under 35U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pederson and Wijk, and further in view of US Patent Publication 2004/0219919 to Whinnet et al. (Whinnet).

Applicants respectfully submit that because claim 8 depends from claim 1, claim 8 is allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional features recited in claim 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 10 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pederson and Wijk, in further view of US Patent Publication No. 2002/0018010 to Le.

Applicants respectfully submit that because claims 10 and 19 depend from claims 1 and 14, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as claims 1 and 14, as well as for the additional features recited in these dependent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 10 and 19 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pederson, Wijk and Le, in further view of US Patent No. 6,735,436 to McCauley et al. (McCauley).

Applicants respectfully submit that because claim 11 depends from claim 1, claim 11 is allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional features recited in these dependent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pederson and Wijk, in further view of US Patent Publication No. 2004/0219919 to Whinnet.

Applicants respectfully submit that because claim 21 depends from claim 14, claim 21 is allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 14, as well as for the additional features recited in claim 21. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 21 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pederson, Wijk and Le, in further view of US Patent Publication No. 2002/0107031 to Syrjarinne.

Applicants respectfully submit that because claim 23 depends from claim 14, claim 23 is allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 14, as well as for the additional features recited in these dependent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 23 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pederson and Wijk, in further view of US Patent Publication No. 2004/0053606 to Artamo.

Applicants respectfully submit that because claims 24 and 25 depend from claim 14, claims 24 and 25 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 14, as well as for the additional features recited in claims 24 and 25. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 24 and 25 is respectfully requested.


The Office Action objected to claims 5, 13, 16 and 22 for being dependent from a rejected base claim. As discussed above, the subject matter of claims 5, 13 and 16 are incorporated into claims 1 and 14 respectively, and cancelled. Claims 13 and 22 are rewritten into independent form. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 13 and 22 is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-3, 6-14 and 17-25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the present application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
David E. Brown  
Registration No. 51,091

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

DEB:jkm

Enclosures: Additional Claim Fee Transmittal  
Check No. 15592